

REMARKS

This Amendment, further to the Amendment filed February 7, 2011, in reply to the Office Action dated August 9, 2010, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-6 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. (JP 10-149210, hereinafter “Yamamoto”).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

Examiner Interview

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview date March 17, 2011 and the suggestions made therein. The Applicants have incorporated the suggestions in the present Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Rejections of Claims 1-3

The Applicants respectfully amend claims 1-3. The amended claims are believed to be proper under section 112. The added limitations are supported throughout the Specification, including the examples.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 as being anticipated by Yamamoto.

The Applicants respectfully reiterate that the claims require the transfer function of an approximate model that represents the control object with the Laplace operator. However, the transfer function that is disclosed in Yamamoto is the transfer function of the entire control system and not just the transfer function of the control object. It is very clear to a skilled artisan that the transfer function of just the control object as in the present invention is completely different from the transfer function of the entire control system as disclosed in Yamamoto.

In addition, and in particular, it is noted that the N-order filter processing in the present invention is not based on any control parameters. Accordingly the real time computation requires is significantly reduced. Furthermore, the value of N is based on a transfer function from a motor position of a control object to the load position with Laplace operator.

The Applicants respectfully amend the claims to clarify the above discussed important distinctions between the present invention and Yamamoto.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131 *citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Yamamoto does not disclose the present invention because it does not disclose at least the limitations related to the transfer function of the control object and the fact that transfer function in Yamamoto requires the control parameters, making any real time computation significant more complex.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 14, 2011

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355